

Axtell, the candidate Mr. Truman indorsed, defeated Slaughter in the primary, but Axtell in turn lost to a Republican.

Slaughter, who maintains law offices in Kansas City, commented after the judge's decision that "today's events are one more chapter in a political fight." He said he was happy to be able to demonstrate that "the Government never had a case."

Judge Holtzoff asked Government attorneys at the end of their opening argument whether they intended to show Slaughter performed any acts of lobbying by contacting Congressmen outside of committees.

Frank H. Patton, Assistant Attorney General, replied that the Government proposed to prove that Slaughter made long-distance calls to Congressmen and sent the bills to his clients. In reply to a question from the judge he said he did not know what was said during the calls.

Judge Holtzoff then indicated he would not permit the testimony unless there was proof of the nature of the conversation.

Similarly Patton said the Government expected to show Slaughter was on the House floor—a privilege given former Congressmen—when one of the bills in which he was interested was being considered. But he said he did not know what Slaughter might have said to the Congressmen.

[In one case Slaughter was accused of seeking defeat of the International Wheat Agreement.]

[The International Wheat Agreement sets sale terms for about half the wheat moved in world trade. It went into effect August 1, 1949, and embraced 41 big wheat-producing and importing nations, including the United States.—Editor's note.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is amazing what one hears in a political year.

Mr. BREWSTER. And also what one does.

Mr. LUCAS. I know very little about the Slaughter case. I assume that those responsible for the indictment of Mr. Slaughter were members of a Federal grand jury, who heard all the evidence presented, and who at least believed there was a case against him. The court held yesterday there was not a case, and dismissed it.

I presume if one wanted to look into the records of the Federal courts it would be possible to discover every year a case in which an indictment had been returned, which the court had dismissed for lack of evidence. It certainly is not an unusual situation, either in the Federal courts or in the State courts.

Insofar as the resolution is concerned, which is the subject of the present discussion, and which seeks to investigate the interstate crime situation, I think I have made myself clear, to those who desire clarity, that the Senator from Illinois will desire in no way to thwart the efforts of the investigating committee, which will be appointed ultimately, to go fully into the question of interstate criminal activities.

As I said yesterday, members of such committee may go as far as they desire; they may look into any crime interstate in character they desire to investigate; they may go into any State they desire, or to any place, so far as I am concerned. I have no hesitancy in saying that certainly I shall have no disposition to thwart the efforts of the committee.

However, I am sure the Senator from Maine, who, most of the time, has gone

along with the foreign policy of the United States, would not say to the Senate or to the country that the consideration of this resolution, which we know would require at least 2 days for debate, is more important to the Senate and to the country than is the consideration of the European recovery program, which the Senate took up last night. The Senate, by a voice vote, said overwhelmingly—and I think the votes came from both the Republican and Democratic sides of the aisle—that the ECA authorization bill which is now pending before the Senate was far more important than consideration of a resolution dealing with the existence of crime syndicates throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, that is about all I care to say. I repeat what I said in the beginning: This is a political year, a year in which Senators are to be reelected, and we may expect to hear the Senator from Maine and other Senators denouncing and criticizing the administration from practically every conceivable angle. We expect that, Mr. President, in an election year. If the time were a year ago the Senator probably would not have taken the floor and defended Mr. Slaughter in such glowing and eloquent terms.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2911. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as executive director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites; and

H. R. 6656. An act for the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 19, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 18 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

John C. McQueen

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose heart always responds to those who truly seek to wor-

ship and serve Thee, may this moment of prayer be one of insight and of inspiration.

We pray that Thy servants may be blessed with a clear vision of the high and helpful things they may do together as they again assemble to take counsel with one another.

Thou knowest how deeply concerned they are about the welfare of our own beloved country and all mankind. Inspire them with those noble impulses and desires which are the progenitors of achievement in building a better world.

May we feel the compelling constraint to labor more earnestly as we look forward to the coming of that glorious day of peace which Thou dost will and sanction.

Hear us, in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 6, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to a special order agreed to on April 5, 1950, the Clerk of the House of Representatives received on April 14, 1950, a message from the Senate announcing that the Senate had passed without amendment the concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 190. A concurrent resolution to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONERS ON THE PATRIOTS' DAY CELEBRATION COMMISSION AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Concurrent Resolution 190, Eighty-first Congress, and the order of the House of April 5, 1950, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did on April 14, 1950, appoint as Commissioners on the Patriots' Day Celebration Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. LANE, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. GOODWIN.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5472. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. MALONE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution to correct the formula used in computing the income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1947, 1948, and 1949.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

APRIL 17, 1950.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the authority granted on April 5, 1950, the Clerk received on the following dates, from the Secretary of the Senate, the following messages:

On April 11, 1950:

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2246) entitled "An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2734) entitled "An act to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2559) entitled "An act to authorize the extension of officers' retirement benefits to certain persons who while serving as enlisted men in the Army of the United States during World War II were given battlefield promotions to officer grade and were incapacitated for active service as a result of enemy action"; and

That the Senate had passed without amendment the concurrent resolutions of the House of Representatives of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 125. A concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed 5,000 copies of the hearings, held before said committee, on the resolutions entitled "Study of Monopoly Power"; and

H. Con. Res. 192. A concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of hearings relative to revenue revision held before the Committee on Ways and Means during the current session, including an index; and

On April 12, 1950:

That the Senate had passed without amendment the bill H. R. 6656, for the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini; and

On April 13, 1950:

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5839) entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2911) entitled "An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as executive director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense

Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites"; and

That the Senate had passed without amendment the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 190, to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriot's Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775; and

That the Senate had passed with amendments the concurrent resolutions of the House of Representatives of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 184. A concurrent resolution authorizing the holding of ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the presentation of a statue of the late Brigham Young; and

H. Con. Res. 186. A concurrent resolution authorizing a statue of the late Brigham Young, of Utah, to be placed in Statuary Hall.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5839. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on April 5, 1950, he signed enrolled bills as follows:

On April 12, 1950:

S. 2246. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2559. An act to authorize the extension of officers' retirement benefits to certain persons who while serving as enlisted men in the Army of the United States during World War II were given battlefield promotions to officer grade and were incapacitated for active service as a result of enemy action; and

S. 2734. An act to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes.

On April 14, 1950:

H. R. 5839. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

PATRIOTS' DAY CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Concurrent Resolution 190, Eighty-first Congress, and the order of the House of April 5, 1950, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did on April 14, 1950, appoint as commissioners on the Patriots' Day Celebration Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. LANE, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. GOODWIN.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

APRIL 18, 1950.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the President of the

United States, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, received in the office of the Clerk on April 15, 1950.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

NATURAL GAS ACT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 555)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1758, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended.

This bill would preclude the Federal Power Commission from regulating sales of natural gas to interstate pipe-line companies; for resale in interstate commerce, by producers and gatherers who are not affiliated with the buyers. After careful analysis and full consideration, I believe that such an action would not be in the national interest.

I believe that authority to regulate such sales is necessary in the public interest because of the inherent characteristics of the process of moving gas from the field to the consumer. Unlike purchasers of coal and oil, purchasers of natural gas cannot easily move from one producer to another in search of lower prices. Natural gas is transported to consumers by pipe lines, and is distributed in a given consuming market by a single company. The pipe-line companies, and in turn the consumers of natural gas, are bound to the producers and gatherers in a given field by the physical location of their pipe lines, which represent large investments of funds, and cannot readily be moved to other fields in search of a better price.

These characteristics of the natural-gas business impose natural limitations upon effective competition among sellers. Competition is further limited by the degree of concentration of ownership of natural-gas reserves. While there are a large number of producers and gatherers, a relatively small number of them own a substantial majority of the gas reserves. Furthermore, the demand for natural gas has been growing phenomenally in recent years, and its natural advantages as a fuel, coupled with its present price advantage, indicate that demand may soon be pressing hard upon total supplies.

Under these circumstances, there is a clear possibility that competition will not be effective, at least in some cases, in holding prices to reasonable levels. Accordingly, to remove the authority to regulate, as this bill would do, does not seem to me to be wise public policy.

It is argued that regulation of sales of natural gas to pipe-line companies would discourage producers and gatherers from selling their gas in interstate commerce, and would discourage exploration and development of new wells. This claim rests primarily on the assumption that the Federal Power Commission would apply standards of regulation which did not take account of the peculiar circumstances of natural-gas production—such as the cost of exploration and develop-

ment, including the drilling of dry holes. I do not believe this assumption is well-founded. On the contrary, I am confident that the Commission will apply standards properly suited to the special risks and circumstances of independent natural-gas producers and gatherers.

My confidence in this outcome is supported by the fact that, until recently, the Commission has not found it necessary to undertake to regulate the prices charged by independent gas producers and gatherers, although those prices have been advancing. It is only natural that prices have risen, since the interstate lines built during and since the war have offered a far wider market than existed previously and have resulted in more competition among buyers. This process of price adjustment will probably continue, and it is right that it should if held within reasonable limits.

Accordingly, producers and gatherers are finding, and I am sure will continue to find, strong incentives to search out new sources of natural gas and to sell their gas in interstate commerce. I believe the production and sale of natural gas will continue to grow rapidly, to the benefit of consumers and of all the businessmen concerned with serving them. I see no danger to that growth in the continuance of the authority of the Federal Power Commission to regulate sales of gas to interstate pipe lines.

The continuance of that authority will adequately protect the public interest by permitting the Commission to prevent unreasonable and excessive prices, which would give large windfall profits to gas producers, at the expense of consumers, with no benefit to the Nation in terms of additional exploration and production. Such cases are few, if any, at the present time, but the authority to deal with them in the future clearly should not be dissipated.

Experience may demonstrate that some improvement of the existing statute may be desirable. I have no doubt that the Commission will operate reasonably and in the public interest in carrying out the present law, but I would have no objection to reasonable amendments if they are found to be needed.

To withdraw entirely from this field of regulation, however, impelled only by imaginary fears, and in the face of a record of accomplishment under the present law which is successful from the standpoint of consumer, distributor, carrier, and producer alike, would not be in the public interest. Accordingly, I am compelled to return this bill without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 15, 1950.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed.

A REGRETTABLE VETO

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I include at this point the following editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of April 16, 1950:

A REGRETTABLE VETO

Mistakenly, we strongly believe, from the standpoint of the interests of the gas industry and gas consumers, President Truman has vetoed the Kerr amendment to the 1938 Natural Gas Act. In view of the favorable attitude he is understood to have held toward the measure in the amended form it was passed by both Houses of Congress, Mr. Truman's surprising veto can be attributed only to the intense and powerful pressure that has been built up against the bill. We think it safe to predict that many of those who have helped to bring this pressure to bear will live to see that they were acting against their own interests.

A large part of the tremendous pressure for veto of the bill has come from misguided representatives of the consuming public who have an erroneous understanding of the measure and its effect. This misunderstanding has produced widespread (although baseless) fear in natural-gas consuming States that if the bill became law it would mean an increase in the price they pay for gas. It is a misrepresentation which has been deliberately fostered by some and innocently accepted by many. Opponents of the measure have represented it falsely as "removing" gas producers from Federal control, as "killing" Federal regulation of the price charged for gas by producers, and as thus paving the way for a gigantic "grab."

BILL ONLY DEFINED INTENT OF LAW

The measure, of course, does nothing of the kind. It does not remove Federal control of natural-gas prices at the well, for no such control ever existed. Nor, until recently, has the power of the Federal Government to exercise that control ever been claimed. The Kerr bill was intended merely to make clear the intent of Congress that the Government should have no such authority. It would have preserved the policy that has been in force for the last 12 years, and under which a marked decline in the cost of gas to the consumer has occurred.

Defeat of the measure—and it seems unlikely that Congress will be able to override the President's veto—may well bring about just what opponents were seeking to forestall. Instead of holding down the price of gas, it may mean less gas at a higher price.

For the independent producers of gas—those who have no connection with interstate pipe lines—now are left in fear that they will be brought under the price-fixing controls of the Federal Power Commission. Already, under the ambiguous language of a Supreme Court decision, moves have been made in that direction. The FPC has indicated that in such case its policy would be to permit independent producers a return of only 6 percent on their investment in producing wells, with no allowance to offset even the cost of drilling wells which fail to produce.

Gas wells often are brought in incidental to the drilling of an oil well. In such instances, producers might elect to shut in the well rather than subject themselves to FPC regulation, realizing that from the control of gas it would be only a short step to the control of oil, and thence to nationalization of the entire energy-producing industry—coal and water power as well as gas and oil. Thus might be started a chain of price fixing by Government edict would mean the death of the whole principle of free enterprise upon which the economy of this country has been built.

The certain result of the regulation foreshadowed by the Kerr bill veto will be the production of less gas. Texas Railroad Commissioner Ernest Thompson has reported that 3,504 completed gas wells in the State already are shut in because of the fear of their owners that selling gas in interstate commerce will bring them under utility regulation. The owners of these wells cannot

be blamed if they keep them out of production. More gas may be withdrawn from interstate commerce, in this and other producing States. Unwillingness to subject themselves to rigid Federal controls will have the effect of discouraging many producers from drilling new gas wells.

WOULD MEAN GAS SUPPLY CURTAILMENT

This not only would mean less gas for areas in consuming States now receiving this fuel, but a halt to the extension of pipe lines to supply areas which want but do not have natural gas. It is pertinent to mention that the lessening of gas supply and the halt in extension of gas service to new areas would follow closely another boost in the price of coal due to the recent \$105,000,000 annual increase in wages won by the mine workers. The fact that coal prices have been steadily on the increase, while gas prices have been declining, no doubt is the reason for some of the powerful opposition to the Kerr gas bill.

While the coal industry may be protected, plainly the coal consumer is not going to be benefited by being cut off from an alternate type of fuel whose price is not at the mercy of Czar John L. Lewis' whim. Neither are those consumers who, now using gas, may be thrown back by curtailed supply upon dependence on coal for heating their homes and operating their industries.

CONTRACTS WOULD BE MEANINGLESS

That the apprehension of producers over lost freedom of action is real is evidenced by the views of some power commissioners that, under Federal control, wells delivering gas to an interstate pipe line would have to continue to do so, regardless of contract expiration. This not only would rob producers of freedom to sell their product in a competitive market but it would make them extremely reluctant to contract for interstate sale of gas. At first blush such a requirement might seem to protect consumers against shrinkage in the gas supply. But gas wells give out, and connections with new ones would be necessary to maintain supply. Producers might be far more inclined to sell their gas at home for what it would bring in a competitive market, rather than deliver it at a rigidly controlled price into interstate commerce.

Texas, as a principal gas producing State, stands to lose heavily by veto of the Kerr bill. Nobody, except a few interests which have shown scant regard in the past for the public welfare, stands to gain by it. We believe the national interest and national defense have not been served, but have been seriously damaged, by the veto action.

WHOLESALE TARIFF CUTTING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I note in the newspapers that we are going to be requested to allow the State Department to monkey with the tariff again, and that they have some 2,500 items on which they wish to reduce the tariff. Let me say to the Members of Congress and to the American people who want to work, and to American industry which wants to operate, that if you are going to permit these tariffs to be cut by the State Department, a body that has no right to monkey with the tariff, you are going to have a lot of unemployment in this country and a lot of mills and factories closed down, with our people walking around

looking for jobs. But there will be no jobs; the foreign countries are going to import all the things necessary to take care of the American people. If that is the way the State Department expects to handle the situation, it is wrong. I beg of the Congress to diligently watch the reciprocal trade agreements. It is time, high time, for us to stop looking after other people, all over the world. Let us keep in mind it is our duty to look after the American people. The New Deal and the Fair Deal will be a raw deal for America.

PATRIOTS' DAY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate for passing Concurrent Resolution 190, which commemorates the celebration of the Battles of Lexington and Concord. Tomorrow is the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of these battles and it forcefully commands our attention again to the notable fact that freedom is the most valuable asset of mankind and that once gained and experienced death is preferable to its loss. This was the spirit in the heart of every patriot of Concord and Lexington and the nearby villages and towns on the morning of the 19th of April 1775. Forever since then this spirit has been alive and burning in the mortal heart of every patriotic American. As darkness merged into dawn of that momentous Wednesday the fate and destiny of a great nation smoldered within their rugged breasts. Nobly and courageously they dared to be free and their valor breathed life into the Nation which has twice saved the world from oppression and slavery and which stands at this threatening moment as the champion of freedom. In rightful tribute forever and always never have so many owed so much to so few. In this fateful hour our solemn duty orders us to hold fast to all they gained and to measure every act and deed for we cannot fail to successfully meet the test of our times. This spot of earth on which freedom was born is immortal and I am proud, so deeply proud to represent it in the Congress of the United States.

THE NEED FOR REMOVING EXCISE TAXES

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from visiting my constituents, as have most of the Members of this House. I was very much impressed with the worry that is in the minds of most of the people in the great State of New York. First of all, the people are harassed by taxes. They can-

not understand why this, the Eighty-first Congress, has done nothing about removing the excise taxes that are plaguing the people. They are putting this responsibility squarely at our door. It is a very hard question to answer.

There is literally a buyers' strike in New York State; department stores are very empty; their sales are down. I see by the newspapers this morning that last month's sales were off from 7 to 10 percent. Unemployment is on the increase and, besides that, people are disturbed by rumors that all is not well in Washington in Government departments, notably in the Department of State. They are saying, "What is the Congress doing?" It is waxing late; we must act now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

CONTINUANCE ON PAY ROLL OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 454.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to the continuance on the pay rolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners," approved August 21, 1935, is hereby amended to read as follows: "That notwithstanding the provisions of the third paragraph under the heading 'Clerical assistance to Senators' of section 1 of the Legislative Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 2, sec. 92a), in case of the death or resignation of a Member of the House during his term of office, the clerical assistants designated by him and borne upon the clerk-hire pay rolls of the House of Representatives on the date of such death or resignation shall be continued upon such pay rolls at their respective salaries until the successor to such Member of the House is elected to fill the vacancy."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how does that differ from the present law?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, this differs from the present law to the extent that there is a 6-month limitation in the present law, and this will permit clerical employees designated by a Member who may have resigned or who may have been removed by death to remain on until a successor is chosen.

I may say to the gentleman that this resolution comes up at this time because of a particular situation existing in the case of our late colleague from Illinois, Mr. Gorski. No special election is to be held to fill his place and that constituency will be without a contact in Washington until after the next election. That is the purpose of the present resolution.

Mr. RICH. It keeps the office force intact for the handling of the affairs of that district until an election is held?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct, and I understand that it will apply also in the

case of our late colleague, Mr. Church, of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am having more of my usual trouble about being confused and uncertain as to just what to do.

Last week when the Kerr bill was up for consideration I listened very carefully, very attentively, to the eloquent speech made by our distinguished Speaker. I would have been almost persuaded to vote the way he recommended had I not already been persuaded to vote that way because of what I thought and the bill was a meritorious bill.

However, it would be extremely helpful to Members on the minority side—at least I know it would be to me—if in the future, before urging us to vote for any particular piece of legislation, our distinguished Speaker would learn whether or not if we voted as he recommended and the bill was passed by the Congress, it will be vetoed or signed by the President.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing a copy of the veto message of the President in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The veto message has already been printed in the RECORD as it was read in the House.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 I was given permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am advised that the cost exceeds the amount allowed in the sum of \$225.50. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the matter may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately following the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill H. R. 1758, and include an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Mr. Rockwell, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$270.34.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and to include in each case extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short quotation from Professor Monk, of the University of North Dakota, on peace.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Mr. John B. Trevor.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article, Mr. Truman Takes the Credit.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article, How Your Tax Bill Grew.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a general letter he wrote to his constituents.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain statistical material.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by William H. McIntyre, national vice president of the Society of American Legion Founders.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article by William Henry Chamberlin which appeared in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two letters and a newspaper article.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of Flag Day raising in American

Samoa and include a statement by Peter Tali Coleman, of American Samoa.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include certain excerpts and newspaper articles.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the consideration of the general appropriation bill in the Committee of the Whole today all debate be confined to general debate, that general debate on chapter No. 2 close when the Committee rises, and that we take up the bill for amendment, beginning with chapter 1, tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are we going to have general debate on each chapter later?

Mr. CANNON. Later, as we come to each chapter in sequence, there will be 2 hours of general debate, and the chapter will then be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, are you going to cut that bill down about a billion dollars?

Mr. CANNON. We would like to have the gentleman's assistance in at least holding it to the present figure.

Mr. RICH. I will be here helping to cut it down.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this chapter of the bill deals with appropriations for the House of Representatives, Architect of the Capitol, Botanic Garden, Library of Congress, and the Government Printing Office. Following established custom, the committee has excluded from consideration all items set up under the Senate. No amounts are included in the bill for those items. The other body will therefore have to insert its own amounts when the bill is before it.

SUMMARY AMOUNTS

For purposes embraced by this chapter, total appropriations of \$56,822,450 are recommended, a substantial reduction of \$8,473,946 below the budgetary requests. While the committee recom-

mends substantial reductions affecting numerous items throughout the chapter, we have had little choice but to allow some increase above 1950 appropriations. The amounts recommended exceed 1950 appropriations to date by \$3,379,306, and while this involves numerous increases and decreases as explained in more detail in the report, it comes about largely from two items, namely, \$1,244,000 for mandatory Pay Act costs, within-grade salary promotions, and lapse adjustments, and \$3,050,000 increase for liquidation of contractual obligations in connection with modernization of the Capitol power plant.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A total of \$21,574,735 is recommended for all items under this heading, a net increase of \$503,260 above 1950. This net increase is attributable to the general pay raise granted legislative employees last fall and to increased salaries and new positions established by specific House resolutions in the past several months.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

The Architect of the Capitol is charged with the structural and mechanical care of the various buildings here on the Hill and with maintenance of the surrounding grounds. Total appropriations of \$7,530,900 are recommended. This reflects a \$6,000,000 decrease below requests for the liquidation appropriation for improvements to the power plant, occasioned by the fact that only \$4,000,000 will be needed next year instead of the \$10,000,000 originally estimated. The work has not progressed as rapidly as had originally been anticipated.

For maintenance, repair, and operation of the Capitol building, the Committee recommends \$582,000 which is somewhat below last year and defers or disallows all increases except for a \$6,000 item for urgently needed repairs to a portion of the roof of the dome.

Two hundred and sixteen thousand dollars is recommended for maintaining the Capitol Grounds. The item for reconstruction of the Capitol Plaza and surrounding driveways has been deferred. The committee is not unmindful of the need for this work but felt that it should be postponed until other construction work on the Capitol Building which will involve heavy trucking has been completed.

For maintaining the two House Office Buildings, the budget estimate of \$875,000 is recommended, a net decrease of about \$3,000 below 1950. Eight thousand dollars is allocated for replacement of a revolving door in the old building which at present represents a dangerous and hazardous condition. Another small item of \$8,000 is required and has been allowed to replace some of the obsolete desk lamps in various offices.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

For all items under the Library, \$8,551,000 is recommended. This is an increase of \$469,000 above 1950 appropriations and is attributable almost entirely to Pay Act costs, within-grade promotions, and lapse adjustments, to maintain services at the present level. The

Committee has denied most of the requests for additional personnel but has allowed \$64,600 for approximately 27 additional positions all except 5 of which are for the Copyright Office and the catalog card operation. The Copyright Office is an old-established activity and returns a net profit to the general treasury and thus the additional positions for that office will not be a burden on the taxpayers. The catalog card operation is to a large extent self-supporting, the cost of the additional positions allowed for that activity will be recaptured through increased card sales revenue. Three positions costing about \$12,000 have been allowed to enable the Library to continue to compile monthly lists of Russian publications.

To enable the Reference Service to continue rendering services to Members and Committees of Congress, \$790,000 is recommended. This will maintain the present staff which was increased by about 40 employees with a large increase in appropriation granted last year. In view of the fact that a number of additional personnel provided for last year will not actually have been on the pay roll for the entire fiscal year 1950, the effective level of service rendered in 1951 when the staff will be on a full-year basis should exceed that for the current year.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

For all purposes of the Government Printing Office, including the Superintendent of Documents, the committee recommends \$18,699,800. This includes the usual \$7,500,000 reimbursable working capital fund for the Printing Office and also the funds for all congressional printing and binding. We made a reduction of \$250,000 in the Public Printer's estimate of the cost of furnishing printing and binding for Congress, feeling that the estimate might be a little on the high side although it is somewhat of a guess at this point as to just what are the requirements.

In making the report on this chapter, the subcommittee was unanimous in its decisions, and I wish to express my sincere thanks to the minority members as well as to my colleagues on the Democratic side for their whole-hearted co-operation and the thoroughness with which they discharged the task of writing this chapter of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to touch briefly on the main features of this chapter of the bill and if there are any questions which Members may have, we shall do our best to try to answer them.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. REES. I would like to inquire about two or three items which I know are comparatively small, but I notice you have an increase of \$31,095 for the office of the Doorkeeper. That is in addition, is it not, to the ordinary increases which were allowed in the Eightieth Congress and the first session of the Eighty-first Congress? Thirty-one thousand dollars seems to be quite an increase for a comparatively small office in the Capitol.

Mr. McGRATH. As I outlined in the beginning, some increases are mandatory because of the action of the House

in adopting these various resolutions and of the Congress in enacting the pay raise. The pay increase under this item amounted to \$26,974. Of the \$31,095, to which the gentleman refers, by House Resolution, \$4,121 was mandatory on the committee.

Mr. REES. The same employees in the Doorkeeper's office, but you have increased them by \$31,000 in salary?

Mr. McGRATH. The committee did not. The Congress, by the Pay Increase Act, did.

Mr. REES. How much is the appropriation increased in addition to those provided by the Pay Increase Act?

Mr. McGRATH. Four thousand one hundred and twenty-one dollars. There was \$31,095, and of that amount \$26,000 was in accordance with the Pay Act—\$26,974, to be exact. The Pay Act was the act of Congress, not of the committee. Then increases by House resolutions amounted to \$4,121.

Mr. REES. It was suggested by the Committee on Appropriations of the House at the first session of this Congress that insofar as possible they might absorb some of the additional costs of these offices. Was that looked into by this subcommittee? I thought it might be possible there could be some reductions in force in order to take care of these additional costs.

Mr. McGRATH. Of course, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas knows that these are statutory positions, created specifically by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has again expired.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. REES. I would like to make one other inquiry, and that is with respect to the office of the Sergeant at Arms. There is an increase of \$15,000. Is that the same situation? That is to say, the increases were allowed by the Congress?

Mr. McGRATH. The item was \$15,505, and every cent of that is due to the pay raise.

Mr. REES. The same thing is true with respect to these other increases for employees; is that correct?

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct.

Mr. REES. There are no additional employees?

Mr. McGRATH. You are speaking of what now?

Mr. REES. I am speaking of appropriations for the salaries of officers and employees under the House of Representatives.

Mr. McGRATH. No additional positions under these particular items. The only additional positions I referred to were the 27 in the Library of Congress, 22 of which are for self-sustaining activities and their cost will be returned through additional revenue coming into the Treasury. There are five positions, working on special publications, which are really additional positions.

Mr. REES. The gentleman means that we will recover a part of the funds that are being expended for additional employees' salaries in the Library of Congress under this bill?

Mr. McGRATH. Not only that, but I call attention to the fact that in the

copyright office and in the catalog card index operation they have shown a net profit which was returned to the Treasury.

Mr. REES. As I understand, you have increased the cost of copyrights. A copyright used to cost \$1 and now it costs \$4.

Mr. McGRATH. The gentleman refers to some amendments to the basic law adopted about 2 years ago.

Mr. REES. Perhaps so. That is the reason you have additional revenue?

Mr. McGRATH. It is one of the contributing reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has again expired.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, it can be easily seen at the outset that there was not a great deal of operating, as far as costs are concerned, that this committee could do upon this particular chapter of the budget. The greatest item of all, as shown by the hearings and report, is the matter of salaries and mileage for the Members of the House of Representatives. That is just purely mathematical. There are 435 Members, multiply their salaries, plus the mileage each one gets, and that is all there is to it. As long as the House remains the size that it is, the cost of this particular item will remain as it is.

It is somewhat strange at times, though, Mr. Chairman, to sit as a member of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations and see some of the items that are charged up against the cost of doing business by the House of Representatives and the Senate. For instance, in this budget is the item for the Botanical Gardens. By the greatest stretch of the imagination one cannot conceive of the Botanical Gardens being necessary to the operation of the House of Representatives or the Senate, yet that is one of the items in this legislative bill. Of course, whenever stories go out as to how much Congress is costing, this is one of the items that is always included in the story, for it is in the legislative budget. It certainly serves a wonderful educational purpose; it is, in effect, a living adjunct to the Library of Congress. But I say again we are charged up with that as part of the expense of doing business in the House and the Senate.

A comparatively small part of the business of the Library of Congress has anything to do with our legislative activities whatsoever. The Library of Congress is the biggest and finest library in all the world. It is truly a national library; it is almost an international library, if you please. Its services are used by people throughout the country, and many requests come to it from many parts of the world, for in the Library we have millions of documents dealing with facts and figures from every nation in the world, facts and figures which, prior to the war, assisted us in many ways and, should another emergency arise, will serve to assist us in the future.

And so it goes. In this budget we have to consider the Government Printing Office. Only a small portion of the Government Printing Office business relates

to the Congress, so that actually, although they come before us and submit their facts and figures as to the volume of business, their method and costs of doing business, which amounts to some \$60,000,000 a year with 7,000 employees. That makes it the biggest printing office in all the world, yet the only thing over which this committee has any control as far as expenditures are concerned is the cost of congressional printing, the cost of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the cost of legislative calendars, the printing of digests, the printing of reports, the printing of bills and regulations. So there is not a great deal that we were able to do in that respect. There is one item of \$7,500,000, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has pointed out, which is an annual appropriation and amounts to nothing more than providing a sinking fund so that each year the Government Printing Office has this \$7,500,000 to start doing business, buy supplies, pay their help until they get funds from the various departments of the Government for which they do printing. It is returned to the Treasury later.

The House and the Senate could bring about some economies if they would. It may be a little difficult to do so in some instances, but when you stop to figure the cost of printing each page of the RECORD, if there were fewer words spoken, if there were fewer pages printed, of course, the cost of printing the RECORD could be reduced. Each Member of the House could take it upon himself to ration himself, if you want to call it that, upon the number of articles and items that he places in the Appendix of the RECORD, and especially those items which so often so far exceed the authorized limit, in which cases special permission must be had to print the matter notwithstanding the cost. So some economies can be practiced here by each of us which might in a small way reduce some of the expenditures.

I do not recall that the gentleman from New York mentioned the Capitol Police. They have retained the number that they had last year. It will be recalled that a year ago the Sergeant-at-Arms came in and made a request for an additional number of members for the Capitol Police force, which was denied by this committee. I want to say on behalf of Mr. Callahan that when he came to the hearings this year he pointed that fact out and he stated that he now realized our judgment had been better than his and that there had been no real need for the additional number of Capitol Police and that this year for that reason he was asking for no increase in that force.

Another item over which this committee has absolutely no control and unable to do anything about, is the item of telephone service for the Capitol, including the House and Senate. The other body, of course, works a little differently than we do. Along about the 1st of March, after hearings had started and after the estimates had been submitted to us, we found that the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia had granted the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. an increase in rates. That

was not only on the private users of telephones in the District of Columbia and the surrounding territory but it also affected the Congress of the United States. Here again our hands are absolutely tied. As a result of that increase the taxpayers of America will be called upon to pay approximately \$155,000 more for their Capitol telephone service this year than they paid last year. That in itself is another item of increase that must be faced.

Another situation with which the committee is confronted and again it is powerless to do anything about, is that the House of Representatives, through its Committee on House Administration, brings in resolutions providing for another employee or additional employees. Sometimes that committee brings in a resolution providing for an increase in pay for employees of the House, whether it be for the Clerk or any of the rest of them from the Speaker's office on down. The House passes a resolution and there is nothing that this Subcommittee on Appropriations can do except submit to the dictates of the House and allow that pay or that number of employees for your respective services.

As the gentleman from New York, Chairman McGRATH, has pointed out while this bill does indicate some decreases, it would be no less than honest and no less than fair if the House were not told that some of these reductions are merely delaying actions, as it were, because all we are doing is putting off until a later date some of the things that must eventually be done on the Capitol Grounds and in the Capitol Building itself. When it is realized that parts of this Capitol are 150 years old, when it is realized other parts which we refer to sometimes as "new" are almost 100 years old, it is immediately appreciated the problem that is now being faced in connection with the maintenance of this structure.

There is an item in here which we hope will complete repairs to the roof of the dome which has been leaking. Of course, that must be stopped. The Architect proposed that we rebuild the west terrace, which is one of those places that is over 100 years old. It must eventually be rebuilt. But as we looked it over and studied the entire situation, it seemed to us that that was one thing that could be delayed without any real serious effect upon the structure itself. But some day in the next 2, 3, or 5 years, that job must be done.

As the gentleman from New York, Chairman McGRATH, pointed out, there was a pretty large request for repaving the streets of the Capitol and repaving the plaza, restoring some of the sidewalks and renewing some of the drains. Some of those drains have been in here for unaccountable years. They are full of rust, choked with tree roots and fibers, so that the drainage is not as it should be. These streets around the Capitol were built for what used to be called the carriage trade. We all know that a carriage and a team of horses was not a very great load, it did not make much stress on the surface; but in this day and age of large and heavy automobiles, particularly the heavy busses used by the tourist guides here in Washington, that

load is each year becoming heavier and heavier, and eventually some of these streets are going to give way and then, of course, repairs must be made.

In view of the fact that it was deemed necessary in the comparatively near future to rebuild the terrace, in view of the fact we have at least six more months of heavy hauling and heavy use of the streets by the trucks of the contractors that will resume work on the repairs to the House Chamber and the Senate Chamber, it seemed absolutely false economy on our part to now start rebuilding these streets only to have them torn up by these trucks this fall, and by the heavy trucks and machinery which will be necessary when we undertake to rebuild the terraces. It was our opinion that this was not the time to repave and rebuild our streets or rebuild our sidewalks and drainage system. While that did bring about a reduction in the number of dollars to be spent this year for the Capitol Grounds and the Capitol itself, it has not honestly effected a real saving.

Then again, another item, and a sizable one of \$6,000,000, is not a real economy move, and we must be frank about it. As you will recall, a program is under way to transform the lighting system throughout the Capitol, cutting out many of our boilers where we generate our own electricity, cutting out many of the old transformers we have over in the Old House Office Building and the Senate Office Building as well, and eventually bring to the Capitol electricity, power, and heat generated by and purchased from Pepco, finding, as we have through our studies, that that will save a great bit of money and bring about a reduction in the number of employees, plus increased improvement in the service. It was anticipated that the cost for the fiscal year 1951 would be about \$10,000,000, but further checking with the Architect discloses the fact that \$10,000,000 would not be necessary this year. We could not even spend that much this year, so that that figure was reduced to \$4,000,000, effecting a paper saving of \$6,000,000, but that merely means that next year, when this program gets going at a little more rapid gait, we will be faced with the necessity of increasing this appropriation for this particular item at least that much.

As the gentleman from New York, Chairman McGRATH, pointed out in discussing the Library of Congress, which does call for an item of almost \$9,500,000, they came in to us with a request for quite a few new and additional employees. We looked over all their activities, studied their requests diligently, and we did allow some new employees, as the gentleman from New York, Chairman McGRATH, pointed out, in what we call the self-sustaining activities. One is an activity calling for the printing, preparing, and issuance and sale of library catalog cards which go to all the libraries throughout the country. These libraries pay for those cards, and the receipts from the sales of those cards go into the General Treasury. Those receipts are adequate to pay for all of the employees in the library which are doing that particular kind of work, having anything to do with it, either in the preparation or

sale or distribution. We felt, inasmuch as the Nation's libraries were spending their money to get this service, that they were entitled to as adequate and speedy a service as the Government could give them. Inasmuch as there is no desire on our part and no purpose, surely, to put the Government in the business of selling library cards for the purpose of making a profit, we did allow them some additional employees so that they could more efficiently and adequately care for the demands being made. The only actual new employees outside of those mentioned were three employees to be allowed solely for use in what is called the Russian section of the Library so that these three employees could continue to compile and interpret and collate and publish monthly lists of Russian papers, magazines, and documents so that they might be available if any occasion is had to refer thereto.

The only other place we added any other employees is another self-sustaining operation; namely, the Copyright Office. As has been mentioned, the rates for copyrights were increased last year. Therefore, we thought it was incumbent on us as a duty to those persons who make use of the Copyright Office to give them efficient, speedy, and effective service, so that there should be no occasion for any great delay in the issuance of these copyrights since these persons are paying higher rates for them now. We did allow a few more employees—not as many as they would like to have had—but a number that we thought would be sufficient to bring into efficient operation the Copyright Office work of filing, accrediting, and selling their services to the American public.

If you will turn in your hearings to page 131, which I assume you all have in your office—at least, they arrived there some time ago—you will find that upon my request Mr. Brockwell, the manager of the House restaurant, gives a full and complete history of the House restaurant, when it started, how it started, why it is necessary, and what the problems are that they face each day; the whole story. Therefore, from now on, in case anyone asks you or makes any comment, as is sometimes done in our daily press, about the operation of this facility, the whole story is here.

We roughly estimated that surely the time of a Member of the House of Representatives ought to be as valuable or worth as much as the time of one of the carpenters who works on the building here, \$2.50 an hour. We figured that if only 300 of the Members use the restaurant each day and it would save them an hour, there is \$750 saved every day of the year that the House is in session. For we must be close to the floor of the House, if we are to properly carry on the Nation's business.

Another thing you Members of the House may have noticed in recent days or weeks is the new experimental traffic lights over across the street between the Capitol and the New and Old House Office Buildings. Traffic is becoming one of the biggest problems we have to solve not only in the District of Columbia and throughout the Nation but particularly here on Capitol Hill.

Under the Federal Employees Compensation Act if one of your clerks should be critically injured in crossing a street in this traffic, without proper direction, that one injury to one clerk would cost far more than the cost of installation of these new traffic lights with which we are now experimenting. Therefore, we felt it was a good expenditure of the taxpayers' funds to install one of these lights at one of these corners to see how it works. If it does what the proponents for it say it will do, another light will be installed in the next street. Thus we may be able to have better control of traffic and less hazard to our employees, as well as to Members of the House.

The chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], did mention to you that in our deliberations following the precedent established last year, possibly at my suggestion, we did not look at or listen to any testimony relating to items of expenditure by the other body. We did not touch those items. Not that they are any better than we are, but we felt unless we could hear all of the facts relating to proposed expenditures by the other body, we would not be legislating wisely or properly. Hence, if the other body desires economy and if they want to practice economy in their own expenditures, of course, they, in their wisdom, can work their will on their own requests for appropriations. We are hopeful that they will do as good a job in economizing in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money as we have done for you in the House of Representatives. There is a substantial saving here.

An item of approximately \$180,000 will revert to the Treasury because it was not spent by the House committees, particularly by the Committee on Appropriations. While that in itself may reflect a savings to the taxpayers, my personal opinion is that we could have saved the taxpayers much more than that if the minority on each subcommittee could have a clerk or an employee or an investigator at their own disposal to use any time they saw fit.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the committee report as a whole and call your attention to some language which was inserted under the guiding aegis of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I think it might well be considered not only here, but throughout the Nation and particularly in the vicinity of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.

The report says this:

Economy neither begins nor ends in the Halls of Congress.

It points out there is a responsibility upon the executive branch of the Government to submit annually to the Congress the estimates of the amount that the Government is going to spend through each one of its agencies. Of course, the President having done that, it comes to us in the form of his budget message. We found not only this year, but in previous years, as the various heads of agencies, bureaus, and departments came to us they had but one thought, namely, that it was their duty to support only the President's budget.

That meant they were bound not to ask for any increase over that which the President told them their agency could have, and by the same token they were bound not to suggest any way or place that cuts could be made.

We tried as best we could, under the new performance budget with the lack of detailed information, to find some place where some economies might possibly be made. But without that necessary detailed information formerly contained in the estimates and without the assistance, on our side, of some detailed searching, it was difficult to find any place where these funds were being expended.

But today, with all of the talk of economy, with our mail filled with letters demanding that Federal expenditures be cut so that there can be an eventual reduction of taxes, so that the load will not be so great upon the 60,000,000 workers in America—because they are the ones who eventually pay the greatest share of the taxes, either directly or indirectly—it does seem possible and probable and proper that the Executive himself should issue to each of his agency and department heads an order, if you please—because they are his appointees; he names them—issue an order directing them to bring about economy in their own departments to whatever extent the President thinks it should be, whether 5 percent or 10 percent or 15 percent, and expect them to accomplish that purpose. If they cannot, now that they have raised the salaries of all these men, in order, so they said, to get better men in the Federal service, let them get out, and let the President put in somebody who will effect some economies. Then perhaps we will start getting some place. But that is the President's responsibility. He could and he should do that very thing.

Yet there is some responsibility that comes right back to the House and Senate—not on the members of the Appropriations Committee particularly, but on the members of the legislative committees—because, no matter what bill it is, any new law costs the taxpayers some additional money. Perhaps it is only a few dollars, but it may run into hundreds of millions. On several occasions during the past few weeks, when members of the subcommittees on appropriations would come from their little cubbyhole hearing rooms where they had been trying to bring about some reduction in Federal expenditures, we came into this Chamber only to find that the legislative committees and this body itself had just approved some legislation that wiped out not only what savings we had been able to make but sometimes costing hundreds of times more. We realized then our work had been completely for naught. That is one of the reasons why I introduced a resolution asking that until this one-package appropriation bill was out of the way, and until the Ways and Means Committee had determined what the new revenue tax bill was going to be, we should call a moratorium on all new legislation or resolutions calling for increased spending, or new spending, until we found out where we were going. Of course, I know

where that resolution is. I cannot tell you the exact pigeonhole, but I can come close to it. Until some action like that is taken, I can see no hope for any great economy, if we continue to pass new laws calling for more spending than we can bring about through cuts by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

That CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 31 minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes so that I may answer any questions which may be asked.

Mr. REES. I first want to express my appreciation for the splendid manner in which the gentleman from Kansas has explained this particular portion of the bill. In line with the interrogatories I directed to the gentleman from New York a while ago, I am in favor, of course, of providing all of the assistance and all of the help that is necessary to run our Government. I realize that in this chapter we are talking about only one comparatively small segment of our Government. I would, however, like to inquire whether or not this committee made any exploration or examination with regard to the need of all of the employees now on the Federal pay roll. It has been stated here that funds were recommended for a similar number of employees as last year or, in some cases it recommended one or two additional; but did the gentleman's committee explore or examine into that question at all with respect to need?

I ask that question because last year it was suggested on the floor of the House a number of times that even though salary increases were provided it should be possible to work economies through the employment of a less number of employees. I am just wondering whether this committee had a chance to or did examine into that question?

Mr. SCRIVNER. In answer to the gentleman's question, I may state that to my recollection the number of legislative employees, their designation, their duties, and their salaries are fixed by action of this House through recommendation of the Committee on House Administration. When they have spoken our hands are tied.

The remedy, the thing that the gentleman from Kansas is pointing out, a reduction of the number, whether it be in the office of the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper's office, or the Speaker's office, wherever it may be, must initiate with the Committee on House Administration. If a reduction is to be made the action has to be accomplished through action taken by the Committee on House Administration. Unless they act, our hands are tied.

Mr. REES. One more question. I have had mail from people complaining about the excessive cost of securing copyrights. That subject matter has been discussed by both the chairman of this subcommittee and the gentlemen from Kansas who now has the floor. The cost of a copyright used to be \$1. All at once

it was increased to \$4. Did this committee examine into the question of whether the increase was justified?

Mr. SCRIVNER. No; we did not, because that was not our province. Our Subcommittee on Appropriations has nothing whatsoever to do with any of the charges made by any department or bureau whether it is the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, or the Copyright Office. My recollection is that the fee for a copyright was fixed by statute through action of the House and the Senate. If it is to be revised, there again is the place that the action must be taken. We as a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations have no power to go into the cost of copyrights and by our edict fix that charge, any more than we have power arbitrarily to say that the price of the copyright should be reduced.

Mr. REES. The gentleman a few minutes ago suggested that one of the difficulties faced by his subcommittee and the entire Appropriations Committee is that the recommendations made by these departments with respect to the expenditure of funds is never a recommendation of reduction.

Mr. SCRIVNER. For nearly 4 years I have asked of nearly every witness: "Is there any place in this item where a reduction can be made, as much as a single dollar?" The answer is always the same: "This is the irreducible minimum."

Mr. REES. The gentleman has spent many hours and days listening to witnesses who come before his committee in respect to these expenditures. Has anyone ever testified that there ought to be reductions in expenditures as far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. SCRIVNER. If there was I do not recall it, and I feel that if such recommendation had been made I would have remembered it because it would be such an outstanding event. It would be so outstanding we could not help but remember it. I cannot recall of any single one.

Mr. REES. In other words, it is the gentleman's experience as a member of this great Appropriations Committee of the House that when witnesses come before the committee requesting funds for the various departments of Government, and throughout the whole of the Government, the circumstance is very rare where witnesses recommend that there be reductions in expenses or reductions in the number of employees in any department of the Government?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have heard of none myself, and I know of no other member of the Appropriations Committee making the remark that he heard any such request or suggestion. As a matter of fact, every reduction that has been made has been made over the opposition of the heads of particular departments, bureaus, or agencies, and almost always with the contention on their part that it will cripple the work of their department.

Mr. REES. I make this inquiry in particular for the reason that we are hearing from various sources, including Members of Congress at both ends of the Capitol, that there should be a great reduction in the number of employees of

the Government. So I make the inquiry to find out whether there have been witnesses or anyone come before the committee recommending such reductions, and if so, where such reductions could be made.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I assume the gentleman is talking about the heads of these various bureaus.

Mr. REES. I am talking about employees of the Government, and especially heads of agencies who testify before this committee.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We question them and say, "Well, of course, I assume that you know there is a demand for economy in Federal expenditures. I assume that you surely must be for economy in Federal spending." Of course, all of them "are for economy, but." They say, "We cannot make any reduction in spending in my particular department."

Mr. REES. I am simply calling attention to some of the difficulties facing the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Like every other Member of the House, I have enjoyed very much the fine explanation the gentleman has given of this section of the bill. There is a little matter that has been brought to my attention on several occasions. It is not a world-shocking item. For some time down here in the House restaurant, in order to get bread, the staff of life, put on your table, it is necessary to order it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not only order it but you must pay for it.

Mr. JENSEN. And pay for it; yes. Everybody is willing to pay for it. However, since every other restaurant puts bread and butter on the table, why is not the same custom followed here in the restaurant in the Capitol of the United States? The gentleman comes from a wheat State and I thought possibly he might be interested in knowing why bread, most of which is made from wheat, is not put on the table in the restaurant in the Capitol of the United States.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Bread is the staff of life. It should be on the table—charged for, if necessary.

May I recall to the memory of the gentleman from Iowa and other Members of the House that just a couple of weeks ago through the courtesy of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPKINS] and Mr. Morris Coover, one of his wheat growers and bakers out in Kinsley, Kans., the Members were given without any extra charge bread containing 16 percent more wheat than present-day bread contains. The report I get, which is unanimous, is that Members of Congress wished that that kind of bread were served in the House and Senate restaurants every day.

Mr. JENSEN. It was wonderful bread. I enjoyed every slice.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman from Iowa, another great farm State, for his commendation.

It might be observed that not only is this bread better, more palatable, but if

all bread were to be made with 16 percent more wheat flour, a great part of the surplus wheat problem would be solved, and our people better fed. The wheat growers and millers of Kansas would be quite happy should this be done. We will do our best to bring that kind of bread in, for I understand a baker here is going to start putting in more flour and less chemicals and compounds. The charge for bread though was just another step showing to the rest of the country at large that we can begin to economize at home. In order to make our deficit a little smaller in the restaurants, we are paying extra for that particular portion of food.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to inquire more about the Federal employees. Can the gentleman tell us what the turn-over is in Federal employees in the course of a year? I have heard statements that some four to five hundred thousand Federal employees quit the Federal service each year.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There was nothing brought before this subcommittee regarding that matter, but possibly the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] can answer that inquiry for us.

Mr. TABER. The turn-over runs from 30,000 to 50,000 a month.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That would be about 25 percent a year then?

Mr. TABER. Twenty to twenty-five percent, somewhere in there.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then to reduce the Federal employees, one might tell some of these departments just to stop hiring them for maybe 4, 5, or 6 months and you could get quite a reduction in some of these departments.

Mr. TABER. Well, you could accomplish a very substantial reduction if they did not fill vacancies.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is not the turn-over in the Federal Government higher than in private industry, and why is the turn-over so large in the Federal Government?

Mr. TABER. Well, it is higher than in private industry, and part of it is due to the fact that there is a very large percentage of young people who go into the service who do not stay there but a little while, and never have, and it is partly due to the fact that they are never satisfied, and they always want to get into something else.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wondered whether it was due to the pay or conditions of work.

Mr. TABER. The pay rates are generally higher than they are for comparable work outside.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I asked for these 5 minutes to say a few words

with reference to a problem that I noticed existing in the Southwest. I just came back from home, and I found that the price of eggs there has fallen to the point where it is far below the cost of production. For instance, in the area that I traversed in north Louisiana eggs are selling at retail in large quantities at 25 cents a dozen. I ran across one locality where eggs were selling at retail at 20 cents a dozen. The best eggs, candled and graded, packaged and everything else, are selling around 30 to 35 cents a dozen. I talked to Mrs. Brooks when I got back this morning, and I find she is paying 69 cents a dozen for eggs here in Washington. That impressed me as being entirely out of line. I talked with Secretary of Agriculture Brannan this morning in reference to this problem. The problem seems to be one of merchandising and distribution. It seems that here in the United States we are running a horse-and-buggy distribution system in an atomic age. We cannot get Louisiana eggs, or eggs from the Southwest, which could be bought for from 20 to 25 cents a dozen easily, and deliver them here in Washington for less than 70 cents a dozen, which, to me, does not make sense.

The retailer is selling his eggs for 20 or 25 cents a dozen, which means that the farmer is not getting that amount. He is getting something like 10 or 15 cents a dozen for the eggs down home at the present time.

The matter has been mentioned to me that the cost is in candling the eggs, grading the eggs, crating the eggs, shipping the eggs, handling the eggs, and middlemaning the eggs, and pretty soon the incidental and other costs that arise from the time the eggs leave the farm to the time they reach the home for consumption are almost prohibitive.

It occurs to me that something can and should be done to cut all these intervening costs and give us a streamlined merchandising system in this country. We are not going to get anywhere when we continue on the basis of the farmer's getting nothing for his product and the consumers paying everything to consume the product.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, we are now approaching the end of general debate on the biggest appropriation bill ever considered by the legislative body of any people anywhere in peacetime. It proposes a spending program of over \$41,000,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations advise that the bill represents a saving of one and a third billion dollars over the original budget estimates. It appears that estimated revenue will be between four and five billion dollars less than the amount proposed to be spent.

Furthermore, experience has shown that estimated revenue is likely to fall short rather than overrun. If that is so, then if this bill is passed without further cuts we will be adding between five and six billion dollars to our staggering national debt of nearly two hundred sixty billions.

If the deficit should prove to be \$6,000,000,000 then it will mean that we will be spending every day \$16,000,000 more than we are taking in.

Keeping on running the Government in the red to that extent presents a truly alarming picture and I am satisfied that our people will not be content unless we can come nearer to bringing the budget into balance. We will certainly not be doing our duty in representing our constituents who are demanding substantial cuts in the cost of government unless we effect still greater savings than are contemplated in the report of the Appropriations Committee.

I realize the difficulty of knowing where cuts ought to be made. We all know that there are many duplications and overlappings in the administration of government and we all know that waste and extravagance is ever present. We also know that practically every governmental department and agency is overstaffed. There are many places where an excess of personnel may be reduced without taking away from our people any essential service.

It is unfortunate that we, the legislative body fixing the amount of appropriations, cannot have the cooperation of the executive branch of the Government. Every department head and division head must know full well where savings may be made without any loss of efficiency in the conduct of Government business. Since they will not cooperate to the extent of disclosing their knowledge, then I see no other way than to curtail proportionately and leave it to the various governmental departments and agencies to cut the coat according to the cloth.

My mail contains two classes of letters—one from constituents who ask me when we may ever expect to balance the budget unless we do it now in a period of prosperity and full production. The second class is from constituents who ask me to vote to restore to the appropriation bill some item which has been eliminated by the Committee on Appropriations. Many of these deleted items are undoubtedly desirable, but these constituents must be reminded that such improvements must await a more favorable time when we can better afford it.

I know of no way to economize except to economize. I know of no way to cut expenses except to cut. I feel that the temper of my own people is such that they will not be satisfied with my representation of them in Congress if I preach economy and fail to practice it.

I have never felt that I had to apologize for being one of the so-called economy bloc in Congress and when the votes come on this appropriation bill I propose to be consistent and vote for every reasonable saving which can be made. I know of no other way in which I can demonstrate that I have been sincere when I have warned my people back home that we are headed for national financial disaster unless we can call a halt in reckless Government spending and do it now.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MILLS having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. McGRATH) was given permission to extend his remarks and include two statements, which are estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$205.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. SMITH of Kansas (at the request of Mr. REES), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. MANSFIELD (at the request of Mr. JACKSON of Washington), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. MILES (at the request of Mr. FERNANDEZ), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. DELANEY), for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

To Mr. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio), for an indefinite period, on account of serious illness in the family.

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), on account of active duty in the Navy.

To Mr. ALLEN of California (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), until April 21, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6656. An act for the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2911. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 14, 1950, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5839. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 19, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1369. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on co-operation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of February 1950; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1370. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a letter proposing the transfer to the Department of Police, Los Angeles, Calif., two 38-foot picket boats, hull Nos. C-105172 and C-105173, for harbor police protection of the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1371. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective Departments"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1372. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, providing appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1373. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1374. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, transmitting the third semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) from July 1, 1949, to December 31, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 556); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1375. A letter from the national shipwriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting the annual report of the receipts and expenditures of the Navy Club of the United States of America for the calendar year ending December 31, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1376. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to the subjects of such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1377. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1943 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1378. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas, and St. John, V. I., pursuant to section 13 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1379. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1380. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supple-

mental estimate of appropriations for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$291,000 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 557); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1381. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$240,000, and a draft of a proposed provision for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 558); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1382. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$49,800 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 559); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1383. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 involving an increase of \$7,000,000 for the Post Office Department, together with proposed provisions relating to appropriations for that Department for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 560); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1384. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed loan of the bell of the U. S. S. *San Francisco* to the city of San Francisco, Calif., pursuant to provisions of Public Law 649, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1385. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report on the appointment of Members of the United States Congress in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1386. A letter from the acting chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report of claims paid by the United States Atomic Energy Commission during the calendar year 1949, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, section 404; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILES: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6247. A bill authorizing transfer of land and improvements thereon by the Secretary of the Interior to New Mexico State Fair; without amendment (Rept. No. 1908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 7984. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 8074. A bill to increase from \$5,000 to \$10,000 the maximum amount of deposits insurable by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 8075. A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, relating

to reinstatement of war-risk yearly renewable term insurance and United States Government life insurance by service-connected disabled World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8076. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a) so as to extend the period during which applications for review on appeal to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may be filed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 8077. A bill to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8078. A bill to provide for the modification of certain recommendations relating to flood control on Red Lake River, Minn., to include the construction of drainage canals along the western boundary of the Red Lake Indian Reservation, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8079. A bill to provide for a determination by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as to the feasibility of constructing certain drainage canals along the western boundary of the Red Lake Indian Reservation, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 8080. A bill to permit Chinese students to remain in this country for a period of 3 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8081. A bill to apply unemployment compensation to Federal workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8082. A bill to provide for the erection of appropriate memorial stones in certain cemetery plots in memory of certain members of the armed forces in World War II who are missing, missing in action, or buried at sea; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 8083. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended (59 Stat. 526, 666; 61 Stat. 130), to vest in the Export-Import Bank of Washington the power to guarantee United States investments abroad; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 8084. A bill to advance knowledge on the history and culture of the American Indian through the acquisition and preservation of irreplaceable artifacts and relics; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 8085. A bill to provide a minimum rate of pay for employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8086. A bill to decrease the debt limit of the United States from \$275,000,000,000 to \$257,000,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 8087. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8088. A bill to provide for a maximum of funds that may accrue to the Soldiers' Home permanent fund (trust fund), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8089. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, providing appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8090. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective Departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. Res. 545. Resolution declaring that the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 7 transmitted to the Congress by the President on March 13, 1950; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California relative to location of the Air Force Academy in California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to proposed Federal regulation of size and weight of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to withdrawing the application to Congress made by Assembly Joint Resolution 26 of the 1949 regular session, to propose a constitutional amendment for American participation in a world federal government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to taking whatever action is necessary to prevent the reduction of tariffs on Italian lemons imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to exempting motion pictures and all types of theatrical entertainment from the Federal admissions tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to the earmarking of funds collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to each State to be used in the administration of the unemployment-insurance law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 8091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 8092. A bill for the relief of George W. Colwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8093. A bill for the relief of Regolo Gagliacco and his wife, Gina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8094. A bill for the relief of Yi Fu Chen and his wife, Betty Yi Fu Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 8095. A bill for the relief of Arthur E. Hackett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 8096. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isaac Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 8097. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Adele Vence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8098. A bill for the relief of Teruko Ishikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 8099. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 8100. A bill for the relief of Sabat Joseph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 8101. A bill for the relief of Joseph MacGuffie and Eugene Rohrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 8102. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of L. Shelby Pitts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

2063. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution passed by the General Assembly of Rhode Island, relating to the consolidation of all torpedo activities in order to restore to Newport, R. I., its normal economic life in the centralizing of all manufacture, overhaul, and ranging of torpedoes at the naval ordnance plant, Newport, R. I.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2064. By Mr. HAGEN: Resolutions adopted by the Becker County Farm Bureau, of Detroit Lakes, Minn., in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2065. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Mrs. A. Posthumus and other citizens of Buffalo, Minn., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the radio and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2066. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Wellsboro chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2067. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Hawaii State Constitutional Convention, Honolulu, T. H., expressing and conveying their sincere gratitude and deep appreciation for consistent support of the great cause of statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2068. Also, petition of Mrs. B. W. Kellogg and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2069. Also, petition of Bertha Miller and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2070. Also, petition of Mrs. Minnie F. Barber and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.